



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DISCOVERIES BY THE AMERICAN SCHOOL AT
PLATAIA IN 1890.

VI. VOTIVE INSCRIPTION.

ΑΙΔΕ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΑΝ

- ΚΛΕΩΑΜΜΑΤΙΑ·ΥΟΧΡΥΣ ΥΠ Φ Α ΦΙΑΛΗΝΛΥΣΙΤΤΑΦΙΑΛ
ΔΑΜΩΦΙΑΛΗΝΤΕ Τ ΧΡΥ
ΝΙΚΑΡΕΤΑΦΙΑΛΗΝ ΘΕΟΓΙΤΑ
ΝΙΚΑΡΕΤΑΦΙΑΛΗΝ Ρ
5. ΦΙΑΛΗΝΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΡΑ ΤΥΧΙΣ
ΦΙΑΛΗΝΚΛΕΟΜΑ:
ΜΙΤΑΦΙΑΛΗΝΑΜ
ΙΙΑΛΗΝΘΕΟΙΟΤΑ
ΞΑΝΘΙΤΡΑ·ΩΜΙΣΚ ΑΤΕΙΑ
10. ΣΩΣΙΧΑ·ΟΥΚΕΦΑΛ ΝΙΚΩ
ΛΑΜΠΑΔΙΟΝΕΝΩ
ΣΩΣΙΚΛΕΙΑΕΝΩ
ΛΑΜΠΑΔΙΟΝΑ
ΛΑΜΠΑΔΙΟΝ·ΑΝΑ
15. ΝΟΤ·.....ΟΥΣΟΥ
ΙΔΙΑΔΥΟ
ΝΠΟΛΥ
ΑΛΗΝΑ
ΟΜΑΧΗ
20. - ΙΔΙΑ
ΥΚΑΣΤΗΦΙΑ
ΛΑΜΠΑΔΙΟΝΕΥ
ΥΠΟΝΛΑΜΠΑ
Ι·ΥΞΙΣΜΕΛ
25. Ε·ΓΙΤΑΔΑΚΤΥΛ
·ΝΩΤΙΔΙΟΝΛΑ
··ΛΙΣΤΑΛΑΜΠΑ
··ΑΛΗΝΝΙΚΑΡΕ
·ΑΡΔΑΜΗΑΛΥ
30. ·ΟΛΥΚΑΣΤΗ
·ΡΙΑΛΕΥΚΑΣΤ
ΔΑΙΔΑΔΗΜΗΤ
ΜΝΑΣΑΡΧΑ
·ΟΣΜΙΑΛΛ

Αἶδε ἀνέθηκαν.

- Κλεὼ ἀμμάτια [δ]ύο χρυσ[ᾱ] υπ φ α φιάλην, Λυσίππα φιάλ[ην]
 Δαμὼ φιάλην τε τ χρυ[σοῦν]
 Νικαρέτα φιάλην, Θεογίτα
 Νικαρέτα φιάλην, ρ
 5. φιάλην, Καλλιστρά[τα] [Εὐ]τυχίς
 φιάλην, Κλεομά[χα]
 Μίτα φιάλην, Ἄμ
 φιάλην, Θεοζότα [Πολυκρ]άτεια
 Ξανθίππα [β]ωμίσκ[ον] Νικῶ
 10. Σωσίχα [β]ουκεφαλ[ήν]
 λαμπάδιον ἐνώ[τιον]
 Σωσίκλεια ἐνώ[τιον]
 λαμπάδιον, Ἄ
 λαμπάδιον, Σ[υ]άνα
 15. ἐνωτ[ίδιον χ]ρυσού[ν]
 [ἐνωτ]ίδια δύο
 ν Πολυ[κάστη]
 φι]άλην, Ἄ
 20. [Ἀνδρ]ομάχη or [Πρωτ]ομάχη
 [Ἐνω]τίδια
 [Πολ]υκάστη φιά[λην]
 λαμπάδιον, Εὐ
 [τ]ύπον λαμπά[διον]
 Ζ[ε]υξίς μελ
 25. Ε[ὐ]γίτα δακτύλ[ιον]
 [ἐ]νωτίδιον λα[μπάδιον]
 [Φι]λίστα λαμπά[διον]
 φι]άλην, Νικαρέ[τα]
 Κ[αρδάμη] ἄλυ[σιν]
 30. [Π]ολυκάστη
 [ἐ]ρια, Λευκάστ[η]
 δαῖδα, Δημητ[ρία]
 Μνασάρχα
 [Κ]οσμία λα[μπάδιον] or δα[ῖδα]

35. 1ο ΧΙΝΗΤ
·ΑΙΔΑΘΕ
ΟΙΑΛΗΝΑΝ
ΟΜΟΛΩΙΣ
ΚΟΡΗΤΩ
40. 2ΕΙΜΟΚ
·ΛΛΛΙΣ
·ΑΜΠΑ
ΙΔΙ
·ΟΡΗΤΩ
45. Η
··ΛΗΝ
···Ο
·ΑΡΔΑΜ
·ΕΟΔΟΤ
50. ·ΡΗΣΙΜΑ
·ΙΚΑΣΙΣ
Π
··ΟΓΙΤΑ
··ΑΛΑΜΙ
55. ΔΕΞ
ΔΑΣ
·ΕΝ
·Ρ
ΦΙΑΛΗ
60. ·ΕΩΝΙΣ ΝΥΣΙΑ
·ΕΜΙΣΤΩΔΑΙΔΑΚΟΡΗΤΩ
ΙΩΤΥΡΑΔΑΙΔΑΤΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΑΔ ΝΙ
ΔΑΙΔΑΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΑΦΙΑΛΗΝΦΙΛΩΤΙΣΛΑΜ·ΑΔΑ
ΑΓΗΣΙΣΛΑΜΠΑΔΑΝΙΚΑΣΙΣΤΥΤ·ΝΕΥΤΥΧΑΤΥΤ
65. ΚΕΦΑΛΗΝΤΑΝΑΡΜΩΕΝΩΙΔΙΑΔΥΟΑΘΗΝΟΔΩΡΑ
·ΥΒΟΥΛΑΙΩΝΗΝΑΡΓΥΡΑΝΚΑΡΔΑΜΗΔΑΙΔΑ·Υ
·ΝΩΙΔΙΑΔΥΟΣΥΡΑΔΑΙΔΑΤΑΝΑΡΜΩΔΑΙΔΑΣΤ
·ΑΙΔΑΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΣΔΑΙΔΑΑΓΗΣΙΣΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΜΑΛΑ...ΤΥΤΟΝ
·ΟΛΥΚΑΣΤΗΔΑΙΔΑΣΤΕΝΤΕΔΑΦΝΙΣΔΑΙΔΑΕΤΙΝΙΚΑΔΑΙΔΑΑΓΗΣΙ
70. ·ΑΙΔΑΚΟΡΗΤΩΔΑΙΔΑΙΕΥΕΙΣΦΙΑΛΗΝΟΝΑΣΙΜΑΤΥΤΟΝΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑ
·ΑΙΔΑΔΑΜΟΔΙΚΑΔΑΚΤΥΛΙΟΝΑΚΑΡΗΧΡΥΣΟΝΚΛΕΩΜΗΔΑΙΔΑ
·ΤΥΛΙΔΙΟΝΑΡΓΥΡΟΥΝΞΕΝΟΚΡΙΤΑΕΝΩΙΔΙΑΔΥΟΛΑΜΤΡΙΧΑΔΑΙ
·ΑΡΔΑΜΗΔΑΙΔΑΤΟΛΥΚΑΣΤΗΒΟΥΚΕΦΑΛΗΝΜΝΑΣΙΚΛΕΙΑΔΑΙ
·ΝΙΟΧΑΤΑΕΦΑΥΤΗΣΣΥΡΑΔΑΙΔΑΤΠΑΡΑΜΟΝΑΔΑΙΔΑΚΛΕΟΜΗ
75. ΙΔΑΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΕΙΑΔΑΙΔΑΦΙΛΟΞΕΝΙΣΕΩΤΙΣΚ
ΥΚΕΦΑΛΑΣΙΡΙΣΤΙΝΑΚΑ
77. ,ΣΗΝ
- ΩΦΙΑΛΗ
ΑΜΩ
ΔΑΙΔΑ
ΑΙΔΑ
ΑΙΔΑ
ΠΑΤΡΙ
ΛΑΜΠΑΔΑ
Ω·ΟΥ
Α
ΣΟΒΑΡΟΝ
ΑΔΑΙΔΙΧΙ

35. Μοχίνη τ
[δ]αῖδα Θε
φιάλην Ἀν
Ομολωῖς
Κορητῶ
40. Τειμοκ[ράτεια]
[Κ]αλλισ[τῶ] or [Κ]αλλισ[τράτα]
[λ]αμπά[διον]
Ἡδ[ίστα]
[Κ]ορητῶ
45. η
[φιά]λην
ο
[Κ]αρδάμ[η]
[Θ]εοδότ[α]
50. [Χ]ρησίμα
[Ν]ικασίς
π
[Θε]ογίτα
[Ἰδ]α λαμπ[άδιον]
55. δεξ
δας
εν
ω φιαλη[ν]
[Δ]αμώ
δαῖδα
60. ρ
φιάλην
[Λ]εωνίς [Διο]νυσία
[Θ]εμιστῶ δαῖδα, Κορητῶ
Ζωπύρα δαῖδα, Παραμόνα δ[αῖδα] νι [Εὐ]πατρί[α]
δαῖδα, Φιλοξένα φιάλην, Φιλωτίς λαμ[π]άδα, λαμπάδα
Ἀγησίς λαμπάδα, Νικασίς τύπ[ο]ν, Εὐτύχα τύπ[ο]ν, ω [β]ου-
κεφαλὴν, Παναρμὼ ἐνφῶδια δύο, Ἀθηνοδώρα α
[Ε]ὐβούλα ζώνην ἀργυρᾶν, Καρδάμη δαῖδα, . . υ Σοβαρὸν
[ἐ]νφῶδια δύο, Σύρα δαῖδα, Παναρμῶ δαῖδας τ [δαῖδ]α, Δαιδίχη
[δ]αῖδα, Ἐλευθερίς δαῖδα, Ἀγησίς στεφάνωμα, Λα[μάχ]α[δικα] τύπον,
[Π]ολυκάστη δαῖδας πέντε, Δαφνίς δαῖδα, Ἐπινίκα δαῖδα, Ἀγησί[ς]
70. [δ]αῖδα, Κορητῶ δαῖδα, Ζευξίς φιάλην, Ὀνασίμα τύπον, Διονυσία
[δ]αῖδα, Δαμοδίκη δακτύλιον ἀκαρῇ χρυσοῦν, Κλεώμη δαῖδα . . .
[σ]τυλίδιον ἀργυροῦν, Ξενοκρίτα ἐνφῶδια δύο, Λαμπρίχα δαῖ[δα],
[Κ]αρδάμη δαῖδα, Πολυκάστη βουκεφαλὴν, Μνασίκλεια δαῖ[δα],
75. [Η]νιόχα τὰ ἐφ' αὐτῆς, Σύρα δαῖδα, Παραμόνα δαῖδα, Κλεόμη
[δα]ῖδα, Ἀριστοκράτεια δαῖδα, Φιλοξενίς ἐρωτίσκ[ον],
[βο]υκεφαλᾶς, Ἴρις πῖνακα
[χρυ]σῆν.

The stone bearing the inscription here published was found by Dr. Waldstein in March 1890, covering, with another stone which contained a part of the Edict of Diocletian relating to prices, a grave adjoining the wall of a Byzantine church near the southeast part of the old city-wall of Plataia. The church is marked VI-V on the map showing the field of excavations by the American School (vol. VI, pl. XXIII). The slab is of coarse-grained marble, probably of island origin. The space covered by the inscription is 0.85 m. long and 0.38 m. broad at the top, widening out to about 0.41 m. at the bottom. The stone is finished at the top with a series of mouldings, curved and plain, surmounted by five projecting serrations. It is broken obliquely across from the third line on the right to the fifteenth line on the left.

It was found lying with the inscribed side downward, but must at some time have been very much exposed to wear, either from footsteps or from falling water, so that the inscription is nearly all obliterated beyond recovery. About 12 lines at the bottom may be read almost entirely. Besides this a narrow strip along the left side yields something in nearly every one of the 77 lines which appear on the stone. On the right, we get very little from line 3 to line 58. But for a small fragment found near the main slab, containing an inscribed surface about as large as the palm of the hand, it might have been difficult to determine just how many lines the inscription contained. This fragment shows the concluding word of the inscription.

After the heading, ΑΙΔΕ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΑΝ, comes a list of female names, followed in nearly every case by a single offering, but in several cases by two offerings not connected by a conjunction. The letters are 7 millimetres high, those of the heading 9 millimetres. We are able to see, with tolerable certainty, that the stone-cutter has arranged his letters so that every line begins with the beginning of a word, except that *βουκεφαλῇν* is divided at the end of line 64. As each part of this word made an intelligible unit by itself, this was probably not felt to be a deviation from the principle adopted. Controlled by this principle, the stone-cutter sometimes brings his line to an end before reaching the edge of the stone. This appears to be the case in lines 60 and 61. Line 68 is especially interesting. Here, besides stopping somewhat short of the edge, he seems to have felt that he was going to fill out the space poorly and to have spread the word *τύπον* out of due proportion to the rest. On the other hand, in the next line he saw

himself getting near the end of the line with a good many letters still on his hands. He accordingly crowded them in, so that the ninth letter from the end of that line stands under the first letter of *τύπον*; thus in equal spaces we have in one case five letters, and in the other nine. In the latter case the *sigma* of *Ἀγησίς* is crowded nearly over the edge of the stone. A more marked case of irregularity, however, is seen on comparing the beginnings of the first and second lines. The stone-cutter appears to have started in the first line with letters of a somewhat smaller size than he liked, for in the second line 12 letters fill the space into which, in the first line, 18 are crowded. On account of these irregularities, it is difficult to tell just how many letters are to be supplied where the edge of the stone is chipped away.

In spite of these irregularities, however, the inscription, where it is visible, has a general appearance of neatness and evenness. When viewed in various lights more letters may be made out than appears at first sight possible. Perhaps an eye practised in reading obscure inscriptions would elicit a few more words from the worn surface of the stone. What I have been able to make out is given below.

NAMES.

The inscription yields with reasonable certainty 62 names of women given without the father's name. It consists, in fact, largely of names. But it is not for this reason devoid of interest. As Greek names are embodied thoughts, often highly poetical thoughts, a new name, in an inscription, with a meaning more or less transparent, makes some amends for a lack of matter of historical importance.

In the following list they are arranged alphabetically :

| | | |
|---------------|------------|---------------|
| Ἀγησίς | Ἐπινίκα | Θεογίτα |
| Ἀθηνοδώρα | [Ε]ὐβούλα | Θεοδότα |
| [Ἄνδρ]ομάχη | Εὐγίτα | Θεοζότα |
| Ἀριστοκράτεια | [Εὐ]πατρία | Ἴρις |
| Δαίδιχη | Εὐτύχα | Καλλιστρά[τα] |
| Δαμώ | [Εὐ]τυχίς | Καρδάμη |
| Δαμοδίκη | Ζευξίς | Κλεομά[χα] |
| Δαφνίς | Ζωπύρα | Κλεόμη |
| Δημητ[ρία] | Ἡδί[στα] | Κλεώ |
| Διονυσία | [Η]νιόχα | Κορητώ |
| Ἐλευθερίς | [Θ]εμιστώ | [Κ]οσμία |

| | | |
|------------|-----------|----------------|
| Λαμπρίχα | Νικώ | Σ[υ]άνα |
| Λευκάστ[η] | Ξανθίππα | Σωσίκλεια |
| [Λ]εωνίς | Ξενοκρίτα | Σωσίχα |
| Λυσίππα | Ὅμολωίς | Τειμοκ[ράτεια] |
| Μίτα | Ὀνασίμα | [Φι]λίστα |
| Μνασάρχα | Παναρμώ | Φιλοξένα |
| Μνασίκλεια | Παραμόνα | Φιλοξενίς |
| Μοχίνη | Πολυκάστη | Φιλωτίς |
| Νικαρέτα | Σοβαρόν | [Χ]ρησίμα |
| Νικασίς | Σύρα | |

It is not my purpose to comment here on every one of these 62 names. Most of them need no comment; names like Ἀριστοκράτεια and Σωσίκλεια are too common. The first thing worth noticing in the list is, perhaps, that certain names recur quite frequently. Πολυκάστη appears five times, Καρδάμη and Κορητώ four times, Ἀγησίς and Νικαρέτα three times, Δαμώ, Διονυσία, Ζευξίς, Θεογίτα, Κλεόμη, Νικασίς, Παναρμώ, Παραμόνα and Σύρα twice. Unless the inscription records gifts extending over a long period, we must suppose five different Polykastes, and infer that the name was a favorite one at Plataia.

One is at once struck with the Bœotian coloring of these names. Almost any Bœotian inscription containing a list of names affords some of those on this list. The one name, however, that is distinctively Bœotian is Ὅμολωίς, from a stem that is very conspicuous in Bœotian proper names. Homoloîs is the name of the gate of Thebes at which Amphiaraios made his attack (Aisch., *Sept.*, 573), and the masculine form, Ὅμολώιος, is a common epithet of Zeus in Boiotia.¹ The two compounds with -γίτα, Εὐγίτα, "good neighbor," and Θεογίτα "neighbor to the gods," if not distinctively Bœotian names, are great favorites in Boiotia.² It is perhaps worthy of remark that Θεογείτων in Dem. XVIII. 296 is a Theban.

¹ AHRENS (*De Dial. Aeol.*, p. 76) endorses the derivation of Suidas and Photios, who make this a lengthened form of Aeolic ὅμολος for δμαλός. It would then mean "the even one," referring either to justice or to peaceableness. But this derivation is regarded as fanciful by MEISTER (*Griech. Dialekte*, I, p. 51).

² MEISTER, *Register zur Sammlung der griech. Dialekteninschriften*. The same list will perhaps show a recurrence frequent enough to be marked of such names as Ζώπυρος, Ὀνάσιμος, Παράμονος, all of which occur, the two latter more than once, in the short inscription from Thebes published by RANGABÉ, *Antiq. hellén.*, No. 705.

As names that may be distinctively Boeotian, we may add tentatively : Καρδάμη (see Meister, *Bœot. Inschr. Nachtrag*, No. 499, in Collitz, *Sammlung der griech. Dialekteninschriften*), Μίτα (Meister, No. 506), Παναρμώ (Meister, No. 721), "one who unites everybody." Unusual names not appearing in Pape, *Griech. Eigennamen*, or in other lists which I have consulted, are : Δαιδίχη, Κορητώ, Λαμπρίχα, Μοχίνη. Of these, Δαιδίχη and Λαμπρίχα are *Koseformen* with the common Boeotian ending (see the Boeotian section in *CIG*, and Koumanoudes in *Ἀθήναιον*, iv, 270 seq.). Μοχίνη is probably a *Koseform* also, with a different ending. The stems of this and Δαιδίχη are difficult to make out. A guess at Δαιδίχη would be "my dear little torch" or "light." Λαμπρίχα is evidently "my dear little shiner" or something of the sort.

Pape makes Κορητώ from κόρη. This would doubtless also be counted as a *Koseform* (see Fick, *Griech. Personennamen*, p. xxii f.). The *tau* in this formation is perhaps employed after the analogy of so many forms with legitimate *tau*, as Λεοντώ, Πειστώ, Χαριστώ, Στρατώ, Φιλιστώ, Μαντώ, Θεμιστώ, Καλλιστώ. In Κλεόμη we have a *Koseform* made by shortening Κλεομήδα.³ Thus we have here the two methods of making *Koseformen* : (1) by addition of an ending (*ιχα*), as *Johnnie* for *John* ; (2) by shortening, as *Will* for *William*.

Striking names and apparently not hackneyed, are : Ἡνιόχα, "rein-holder," a name of bad omen for a girl, an epithet of Hera at the sanctuary of Trophonios (Paus., ix. 39. 4) ; Κοσμία, "neat ;" Παραμόνα, "steadfast ;" Σοβαρόν, perhaps "magnificent," Χρησίμα, "useful," Ζωπύρα, "spark" (very common in Boiotia). Ὀνασίμα, "delightful," and Εὐτύχα, "lucky," are just as expressive, but have lost their newness. Ἡδίστα and Φιλίστα are perhaps not open to this charge. Ἐλευθερίς recalls the favorite epithet of Zeus and the festival Ἐλευθερία, at Plataia (Paus., ix. 2. 5 seq.).

OBJECTS MENTIONED IN THE INSCRIPTION.

The following is an alphabetical list of the offerings : ἄλυσις, chain ; ἄμμάτιον, cord, cf. παρθενίας ἄμματα λυόμενα (*Anth. Gr.*, vii. 182) ; βουκεφαλή, cow-head or ox-head ; βωμίσκος, little altar ; δαῖς, torch ; δακτύλιον, ring ; ἐνώδιον, ἐνώτιον, ἐνωτίδιον, earring ; ἔρια, wool ; ἐρωτίσκος, little love ; ζώνη, girdle, like ἄμμάτιον ; λαμπάς,

³ It may be that the full form Κλεομήδα was used in line 74.

λαμπάδιον, torch; πίναξ, tablet; στεφάνωμα, crown or wreath; στυλίδιον, little column; τύπος, relief; φιάλη, bowl; τὰ ἐφ' αὐτῆς.

For the explanation of many of these objects, see Homolle in *Bull. de corr. hellén.*, VI (1882) p. 108 *seq.* There are several here which strike us as unusual; such are: βουκεφαλή, βωμίσκος, δαῖς, ἔρια, ἔρωτίσκος, λαμπάς, στυλίδιον. But strangest of all is the offering τὰ ἐφ' αὐτῆς, "things at her command" (*cf. Ar. Plut.*, 100, τὰ ἐπ' ἐμοῦ), what she was wearing at the time, or something of the sort. This Heniocha "did what she could:" while others gave gold rings and silver girdles of their abundance, she, not wishing to be left out, gave of her poverty apparently some articles not specified.

Of the objects mentioned, δαῖς, although not occurring until line 32, holds the first place in frequency, being mentioned twenty-nine times, and several of these mentions are of plural offerings. Once, in line 69, five δαῖδες are offered by one woman. Besides this, δαῖδα seems to shimmer throughout the bad parts of the stone where the eye sees something like ΛΛ ΛΛ, and again it would come in just right to fill out a line like 3, where we are dependent upon conjecture for the reading. λαμπάδιον is mentioned ten times, once in the plural. A passage in Dikaiarchos (Müller, *Frag. Gr. Hist.*, vol. II, p. 259) might lead us to suppose that this was a headband of the women, or a top-knot of the hair itself. Speaking of the Theban women, Dikaiarchos says: τὸ δὲ τρίχωμα ξανθόν, ἀναδεδεμένον μέχρι τῆς κορυφῆς· ὃ δὲ καλεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων λαμπάδιον. But attractive as this supposition might be, arraying λαμπάδιον, as it does, with the other articles of female dress, it is safer to take it to mean the same as λαμπάς, which occurs three times, and to take both in the sense of δαῖς⁴ with possibly some difference of form indicated by the choice of a different word. These torch-offerings are thus very prominent in this inscription. In the part that is readable, the torch is mentioned about as frequently as all the other objects put together. It is, of course, not surprising to find φιάλη coming next in order of frequency. There is hardly any list of temple-treasures in which the φιάλαι are not the most numerous of all the offerings. Perhaps in most lists φιάλαι are as frequent as all other objects put together. Sixteen hundred φιάλαι are mentioned in the treasure-lists of the

⁴ *Cf. CLEMENS, Protr.*, II. 22: αἰδέσθητι, δαδοῦχε, τὰς λαμπάδας.

Delian Apollo.⁵ This displacement of the *φιάλη* from the place of honor makes the torch-offering peculiarly prominent.

In the Kabeiroi inscription published in the *Mittheilungen Athen*, 1890, p. 378 *seq.*, we have a list of names of men and women together with their offerings, among them the following :

Σκόπας . . . ἄλυσιν·

᾽Οκυθόα . . . μάστιγα, δαΐδα·

Ἐνώμα δαΐδα ἀργουρίαν, ὀλκὰ δραχμὰ τρεῖς ὀβολοί·

Ἐρατὼ φιάλιον ἀργούριον.

This is the only inscription which I have been able to find containing *δαΐς* as an offering, though *λύχνος* and *λυχνία* are not infrequent.⁶ *CIG*, 1570, which gives an account of old offerings in the temple of Amphiaraios near Oropos, is also an analogous list, though of the articles on our list it names only the inevitable *φιάλη*, and this a good many times.

The lists of temple-treasures published in the *Corpus* and the archaeological periodicals naturally contain many of the objects here mentioned. Omitting *φιάλη*, as found nearly everywhere, the Parthenon lists (*CIA*, II, 642 *seq.*) contain : ἄλυσις, δακτύλιος, ἐνώδιον, ἔρια, πίναξ, στέφανος ; and for *βουκεφαλή* we have *κρίου κεφαλή* and *λέοντος κεφαλή*. The lists of Artemis Brauronia (*CIA*, II, 751 *seq.*) contain, besides the old clothes : ἄλυσις, δακτύλιος, ἐνώδιον, ἔρια, στέφανος, τύπος. The Asklepieion lists (*CIA*, II, 766 *seq.*) contain : δακτύλιος, πίναξ, στέφανος, τύπος ; also objects bound with a golden ἄλυσις, and objects ἐν or πρὸς πίνακι. The lists of the Delian Apollo (*Bull. de corr. hellén.*, 1882, pp. 1-167) contain : δακτύλιος, ἐνώτιον, λαμπάς, στέφανος and στεφάνωμα, τύπος. Analogous to *δαΐς* is, perhaps, *πέυκη κληματίς*. Here appear also objects with ἁλύσεις, also *βουκεφάλια* and *αἰετοῦ κεφαλή*. The Eleusis lists (*Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1888, p. 42 *seq.*) contain : δακτύλιος, ἐνώδιον, στέφανος. *CIA*, II, *Nachtrag* 682° has πίναξ, and also λαμπαδεῖον. The silver-inventory of Amphiaraios (*Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχ.*, 1889, p. 1 *seq.*) has, besides *φιάλη*, *βωμίσκος* several times, as well as *φύλλα τοῦ στεφάνου*, and objects with figures of Ἑρως on them.

⁵ HOMOLLE, *Bull. de corr. hellén.*, 1882, p. 108.

⁶ Cf. *CIG*, 2852 ; LE BAS, *Voyage Archéologique*, III, No. 245 (Smyrna inscription), τὰς λυχνίας σὺν τοῖς λύχνοις. λαμπαδεῖον occurs (*CIA*, II, *Nachtrag* 682°) in an offering to Demeter. Cf., also, *Bull. de corr. hellén.*, 1882, p. 135.

Presumably the objects mentioned in the Plataean inscription were mostly of gold and silver. The reason why the material is several times mentioned is, probably, that the object might otherwise have been understood to be of some other material; *e. g.*, ἀμμάτιον (line 1) might have been supposed to be a cord of ordinary fibre, albeit rich, had it not been stated that it was of gold. So of ζώνη in line 66. The dedicator would not have wished the little column of line 72 to pass for a column of mere marble. δακτύλιον (71) and ἐνωπίδιον (15) are said to be of gold, thus leading to the suspicion that the other rings and earrings were of silver.

TO WHAT DIVINITY WERE THESE OFFERINGS MADE?

It is of course not surprising that the name of the divinity should be omitted. The stone was set up in the consecrated precinct, so that there could be no mistake on that point. There was at that time no thought of the perplexity of the future archæologist who should find the stone amid new surroundings with no means of determining its provenience.⁷ There are, however, certain materials for a probable solution of the problem, though they hardly afford a complete demonstration. The fact that the dedicators are all women points to some female divinity. Among the offerings there are at least two⁸ which are out of the common run of offerings such as appear in most temple-inventories, and which, while they demand an explanation why they were offered, afford at the same time the materials for an answer to our question. The first is βουκεφαλή, which is mentioned twice. The cow-heads found by Dr. Schliemann at Mykenai may be taken, as understood by him, to be an offering to Hera, as patron goddess of the city.⁹ This is a very natural offering to the ancient moon-goddess, but the difficulty, with the supposition of Hera, is to account for the torch. This also might be thought to be a not unnatural offering to the goddess who presided over marriage. On the Io vase in the Berlin Museum, the image of Hera is represented as holding in

⁷ Most of the offerings at Delos are without the name of Apollo. The Athenians had no need to state that their stoa at Delphi was dedicated to Apollo.

⁸ ἐρωτίσκος, βωμίσκος, and στυλίδιον, not to mention some other objects, are also peculiar; but they occur only once.

⁹ SCHLIEMANN, *Mycenae*, p. 218. Cuts are also given on pp. 216-18 of the splendid silver cow-head with gold horns, and of the smaller ones of thin gold plate with axes between the horns. The large head in question seems certainly more like a bull-head.

one hand a torch and in the other a bow.¹⁰ But it must be confessed that neither in literature nor in the extant monuments of art do torches appear as a characteristic attribute of Hera, and there is very little reason to suppose that any such offering was ever made to her. Probably we should then give up the idea of associating this stone with the temple of Hera which is prominently mentioned by Herodotos in his account of the battle of Plataia.¹¹

There are, however, of the greater goddesses two who are always thought of as the torch-bearing divinities, Demeter¹² and Artemis. This is not the place to multiply proofs on that point, but merely to consider which of these two might be the one to whom this particular offering of torches was made. We have seen that the torch is here the distinguishing object, *δαῖς* and *λαμπάδιον*, having the place of honor occupied in the Asklepieion lists by *ὀφίδιον* and *δρακόντιον*. To one or the other of these two goddesses, then, it is natural to refer the offering. It is true that we do not find elsewhere explicit mention of the offering of a *δαῖς* to either of them, but only to the Kabeiroi. We feel that this is simply surprising, and, if we had the slightest indication that elsewhere to either of these goddesses both a torch and a *βουκεφαλὴ* were offered, we should think it almost a demonstration that that goddess was the one here honored.

Now both these goddesses had sanctuaries in Plataia. That of Demeter is mentioned by Herodotos (ix. 65), Plutarch (*Arist.*, xi) and Pausanias (ix. 4. 2). It was outside the wall, and the battle with the Persians raged around it. Plutarch alone (*Arist.*, xx) mentions the sanctuary of Artemis. After telling the story of the swift messenger to Delphi, who died at the end of his journey and was buried in the precinct of Artemis Eukleia, he adds: "Most people call Eukleia Artemis, and regard her as such; but some say that she was the daughter of Herakles and Myrto, the daughter of Menoitios and sister of Patroklos, and that having died a virgin she has honors among the Boeotians and Locrians. For there is an altar and an

¹⁰ OVERBECK, *Kunstmythologie*, pl. vii. These objects, not being usual attributes of Hera, may be explained as given her in her capacity of Eilithyia. See PRELLER, *Gr. Myth.*, 4th edit., p. 172, note.

¹¹ ix. 52, 61. More recent excavations conducted by Mr. Washington have laid bare the foundations of a building which may prove to be the Heraion.

¹² If Persephone, whose attribute is a torch, was worshipped at Plataia, it would naturally be in subordination to Demeter.

image of her established in every agora, and brides and bridegrooms sacrifice to her before marriage."

The torch would then here be a natural offering to Artemis, even if we found no mention of it in connection with her. But, as in the case of Hera the torch was the difficulty, so in the case of Artemis it is the *βουκεφαλή*; though, even on this score, she is not to be summarily ruled out. Her epithet *ταυροπόλος* is at least suggestive. The story of Iphigeneia bringing her image from the Tauri is perhaps a Euripidean form of a myth connecting Artemis with some forgotten bull-cult. Diodoros (xviii. 4) and Livy (xliv. 44) speak of the worship of Artemis *ταυροπόλος* at Amphipolis; and, what is highly interesting, coins of Amphipolis show a female figure riding on a bull.¹³ Perhaps it is more than an accident that a vase of the Phaleric type in the Polytechnikon at Athens (No. 5839) has, by the side of a so-called Persian Artemis, a *βουκεφαλή* filling a little space which according to the artist's taste ought not to be left empty.

But, after all, these attempts to connect Artemis with the *βουκεφαλή* seem a little forced. Further light may come; but, in the meantime, the way seems cleared for the claims of Demeter. One's first thought, in connection with such a profusion of torches, is of Demeter, and in her case we find the slight indication which we seek, which makes us willing to believe that it was she rather than Artemis to whom these offerings were made. In the chapel of St. Zachariah at Eleusis are two gigantic torches, probably set up at Eleusis in honor of the goddess. We may say then that, if we have not found the name for which we were searching, we have at least found the thing. Furthermore, Karl Bötticher¹⁴ identifies two reliefs, one found at Athens and the other at Eleusis, with the cornices of the altars of Demeter, one in the Eleusinion at Athens and the other at Eleusis. Both these reliefs contain the torch and the *βουκεφαλή* combined. This is the slight hint that we have been seeking. Here is a connection of the two distinctive objects of our list.¹⁵ If these reliefs are of Roman times they

¹³ STEPHANI, *Compte rendu*, 1866, p. 102 *seq.*, gives a list of such coins for Amphipolis and adjacent parts of Macedonia, as well as some other places. He thinks that, wherever we have a woman riding upon a bull with no water indicated, we have not Europa but Artemis *ταυροπόλος*, who is one form of the Phœnician Astarte.

¹⁴ *Philologus*, vol. xxii, p. 385 *seq.*; vol. xxiv, p. 227 *seq.* The Athenian relief is now built into the old, small metropolis church, adjacent to the new cathedral.

¹⁵ This suggestion falls short of a demonstration, because this relief is not an offering. The ox-head is a not unusual architectural ornament, and it may be that only

are not, for that reason, too late to be put in evidence. Eleusis was a home of conservatism. The old customs were maintained under the Roman sway.

DATE OF THE INSCRIPTION.

The inscription can hardly be earlier than 200 B. C., judging from numerous signs: (1) The dialect is an approach to the *κοινή* in some of the names, *e. g.*, *Δημητρία* and *Πολυκάστη*. (2) The forms of the letters have nothing antique about them. The use of apices cannot go much, if at all, back of 200 B. C. The *alpha* with the broken horizontal bar also cannot precede this date.¹⁶ (3) The custom of dividing by syllables at the end of a line is a late one, not introduced at Athens until about 200 B. C., as may be seen by a glance at the *Corpus*. (4) The trace of *iotacism* in *Τειμοκράτεια* argues, though it does not prove,¹⁷ about the same date-limit.

The next thing is to get an approximate date below which the inscription cannot well be put. This is a matter in which it is more difficult to speak positively. But the following considerations may be adduced: (1) The names nearly all retain the *Boeotian* form in the endings. *Δαμώ*, *Δαμοδίκη*, *Ὀνασίμα*, *Ἀγῆσις*, retain the *alpha* in the body of the word. This could not have been the case after 100 B. C., when the *κοινή* had extended, with its levelling influences, to every place in the Greek world. (2) A comparison of the forms of the letters with those of Athenian inscriptions would seem to put this inscription in the first half of the second century B. C.¹⁸

It is doubtful whether the close relations that existed between Athens and Plataia before the Peloponnesian War survived the nu-

the torch is significant. Even the torch on the Eleusis relief looks doubtful. Bötticher regards the objects in question as unlighted torches bound with myrtle leaves. He calls attention to the almost complete similarity of the two reliefs in their general arrangement, and argues from the certainty that the Athenian relief shows torches to the conclusion that the objects on the Eleusis relief must be torches also. The Eleusis relief has the better example of a *βουκεφαλὴ*.

¹⁶ But for one of the alphas in the heading, one might hardly notice that the broken-barred alpha is really present. The letters in the rest of the inscription are so diminutive as hardly to make the break perceptible. Still when one's attention is called to the matter one sees that the middle of the bar is in nearly every case lower than the ends.

¹⁷ MEISTERHANS, *Gram. der attisch. Inschr.*, p. 38.

¹⁸ It seems to be considerably older than *CIA*, II, 455, 460, which fall probably in the second half of the second century, and somewhat older than No. 454, which falls at about the middle of that century.

merous destructions of Plataia and the centralizing influence of the Bœotian League. The Plataia that followed the battle of Chaironeia was largely a Macedonian creation. Yet the loss of a special tie between the two cities was more than made good by the general influence of Athens, which was no longer hemmed in by the borders of small adjacent states. The influence of Athenian custom was at this time probably strong enough to make Bœotian writing, as well as Bœotian spelling, a pretty good mirror of the Attic.

Of single letters, besides the *alpha* already mentioned, the most distinctive are Ι (ζ), Θ, Κ, ο, Π, Ω¹⁹. Any one of these peculiar forms, *i. e.*, the rectangular *zeta*, the small *theta*, *omicron*, and *omega*, the *kappa* with short oblique lines, and *pi* with shorter right-hand limb, might continue into the first century B. C. But it is doubtful whether all of them combined could come down far into the second century. Our judgment as to date must always be guided more by the total impression than by isolated peculiarities.

There are certain contrarieties in our inscription which are worth noting in their entirety, because, if we noted only one class of phenomena to the exclusion of others, we might be misled as to the age: (1) Δαμώ has an ancient look, but Δημητρία looks quite the reverse. (2) Θεοζότα must be old, one would think; for Boiotia cannot have retained the *zeta* for *delta*, which it had in common with Elis (Meister, *Gr. Dial.*, p. 264), after the pressing in of the *κοινή*. But we have also Θεοδότα. (3) Ἀγσις seems old if we look at the *alpha*, but for η we should in Bœotian of any early date have *ει*.²⁰ (4) α final and η final balance each other. (5) The form of the letters Α, Μ, Σ, point to a late date, but the small ο and Θ with Κ and Ι cause one to hesitate. There is also the antique-looking γιτα in Εὐγίτα and Θεογίτα,²¹ against which we have nothing in particular to set as an antithesis.

All these indications, when properly balanced, seem to put our inscription in the time when Greece, under the influence of Macedonian military and political preponderance and of Athenian literary traditions, was losing its provincialism, and when local peculiarities of dialect were being crowded into nooks and corners. A good analogy to this inscrip-

¹⁹ Ψ is the only letter which does not occur.

²⁰ Cf. Ἀγσις in the Thespian inscription published by JOHANNES SCHMIDT, in *Mith. Athen*, v, p. 130; Ἀγσιππος, KEIL, *Zur Syll. Inscrip. Bœot.*, in *Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 4^{te} Supp. Band., p. 521.

²¹ БОЕСКИ, *CIG*, vol. I, p. 723.

tion is afforded by the Silver-Inventory of Oropos, published in the *Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1889, p. 1 *seq.*, which B. Keil (in *Hermes*, 1890, p. 608) does not hesitate, in spite of iotacisms like *ει* for *ι*, to put at about 200 B. C. In its iotacism and its vacillation between *α* and *η*, our inscription is very much like the Nikareta inscription found at Orchomenos,²² which has *Νικαρέτα* and *Νικαρέτη* indiscriminately. In the matter of form, too, if we removed the apices from our inscription, we should have a remarkable resemblance in the letters to the Nikareta inscription, which is dated by Foucart 220–192 B. C., and by Meister 223–197 B. C.

RUFUS B. RICHARDSON.

²² Published by FOUCART, *Bull. de corr. hellén.*, III, p. 459 *seq.*, IV, p. 1 *seq.* Cf. MEISTER in COLLITZ, *Sammlung der griech. Dialekt-Inschriften*.